

## REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed May 2, 2005. At the time of the Office Action, Claims 1-20 were pending in this Application. Claim 21 was previously cancelled by Applicants without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1-20 were rejected. Claims 1, 8 and 15 have been amended to further define various features of Applicants' invention. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

#### Claims 1-13, 15-18, and 20

Claims 1-13, 15-18, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,189,063 issued to David W. Rekeita et al. ("Rekeita") in view of U.S. Patent 6,519,671 issued to Keitaro Kondou et al. ("Kondou"). Applicants respectfully traverse and submit the cited art combinations, even if proper, which Applicants do not concede, does not render the claimed embodiment of the invention obvious.

In order to make obvious Applicant's claimed invention, the references cited by the Examiner must disclose all claimed limitations. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (C.C.P.A. 1974). Each of Independent Claims 1, 8 and 15 include claim limitations directed to two or more host bridge elements. Further, each of Independent Claims 1, 8 and 15, as amended, recites that each host bridge connects one of the bootable devices to a host bridge.

Examiner has argued that Rekeita discloses two bridges. Specifically, Examiner argues that the host bridge 20 and PCI bridge 38 of Figure 1 disclose host bridges as claimed in the present claimed embodiments. Host bridge 20 links PCI device 30 to Host bus 14. PCI-PCI bridge (as its name would suggest) connects PCI Bus 1 (42) with PCI Bus 0 (26). Accordingly, Applicants submit that Rekeita fails to disclose teach or suggest at least two host bridges that connect a bootable device to the host bus, as claimed by Independent Claims 1, 8 and 15. Additionally, Kondou does not disclose, teach or suggest multiple host buses as claimed.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Rekeita and Kondou, considered alone or in combination, fail to teach each and every limitation of the claimed embodiment. Applicants request reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejections under §103 and full allowance of Independent Claims 1, 8, and 15 and Claims 2-13, 16-18, and 20 which depend therefrom.

Claims 14 and 19.

Claims 14 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rekeita in view of Kondou, and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,761,448 issued to Alan P. Adamson et al. (“Adamson”). ”). Applicants submit that Claims 14 and 19 depend from claims that have now been placed in condition for allowance. Applicants request reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejections under §103 and full allowance of Independent Claims 14 and 19.

ATTORNEY DOCKET  
016295.0597  
(DC-02236)

PATENT APPLICATION  
09/596,753

10

### CONCLUSION

Applicants have now made an earnest effort to place this case in condition for allowance in light of the amendments and remarks set forth above. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of Claims 1-20 as amended.

Applicants believe there are no additional fees due, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-0383 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

If there are any matters concerning this Application that may be cleared up in a telephone conversation, please contact Applicants' attorney at 512.322.2548.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
Attorney for Applicants



Brian E. Szymczak  
Reg. No. 47,120

### CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

Customer No.: **23640**  
512.322.2548  
512.322.8383 (fax)

Date: 7/26/05